arXiv:1608.08136v1 [quant-ph] 29 Aug 2016

Zero discord implies classicality

M. Boyer
Département IRO, Université de Montréal, Montréal H3C 3J7, Canada
(Dated: August 30, 2016)

The "classical-quantum" (*cq*) discord of a bipartite state ρ^{AB} is the smallest difference between the mutual information $S(\rho^{A:B})$ of ρ and that of ρ after a measurement channel is applied on the A system. Relating zero discord to the strong subadditivity of the Von Neumann entropy, Datta proved that a state has zero *cq* discord iff and only if it can be written in the form $\sum_i p_i|i\rangle\langle i|\otimes\rho_i^B$ for p_i a probability distribution, $|i\rangle$ a basis of the A system and ρ_i^B states of the B system. We provide a simple proof of that same result using directly a theorem of Petz on channels that leave unchanged the relative entropy of two given states.

Various measures have been proposed to quantify the classicality or equivalently the quantumness in a multipartite state. One of them, "discord", is the theme of this note. Limiting ourselves to a bipartite system AB, given an orthonormal basis $\mathsf{A}=\{|a\rangle\}_{a\in A}$ of $\mathscr{H}_A$, any state ρ^{AB}, i.e. density operator, can be represented by a block matrix with blocks $\rho^B_{aa'}$, corresponding to $\rho^{AB}=\sum_{aa'}|a\rangle\langle a'|\otimes\rho^B_{aa'}$. The state is said to be "classical-quantum" (cq) if there is such a basis for which the matrix is block diagonal i.e $\rho^B_{aa'}=0$ if $a\neq a'$. The operator $\mathscr{D}_{\mathsf{A}}=\sum_{a\in A}(|a\rangle\langle a|\otimes\mathbf{1}_B)\rho(|a\rangle\langle a|\otimes\mathbf{1}_B)$ which replaces off diagonal blocks by a 0 block is a quantum channel that acts independently on the A and the B system (it is the identity on B). It is known that for such channels $\mathscr{E}$ holds the inequality $I(\mathscr{E}(\rho)^{A:B})\leq I(\rho^{A:B})$ where $I(\rho^{A:B})$, the *mutual information*, is $S(\rho^A)+S(\rho^B)-S(\rho^{AB})$ and $S(\rho)=-\mathrm{tr}\big[\rho\lg(\rho)\big]$. It is the infimum of $I(\rho^{A:B})-I(\mathscr{D}_{\mathsf{A}}(\rho)^{A:B})$ over all bases A that was called "discord" by Ollivier and Zurek [1] and that we shall call *qc* "classical-quantum" discord (provided the dimension of $\mathscr{H}_A$ is properly chosen). It is clear that if ρ is classical-quantum, then the *qc* discord is 0. The converse is not obvious. The argument in [1] appears to lead nowhere (cf appendix). Datta [2] gave a proof that zero discord implies classical-quantum using a result of Hayden et al. [3] on the structure of states which satisfy strong subadditivity of quantum entropy with equality. His definition of discord however looks more general than the above since he optimizes over all channels defined by rank 1 POVM's on the A system instead of complete projective measurements. Nevertheless a rank 1 POVM with outputs in M is equivalent to a unitary embedding of $\mathscr{H}_A$ into $\mathscr{H}_M$ with basis the $|m\rangle$ and we can simply apply a projective measurements in $\mathscr{H}_M$. In fact, we can always choose M of size at most d_A^2 where $d_A=\dim\mathrm{supp}(\rho^A)$ so that we need only choose $\mathscr{H}_A$ of dimension d_A^2 and work with block matrices. Details are to be found in the appendix where it is also shown that there is always a basis corresponding to the discord. The following theorem thus implies that if the *cq* discord is 0, the state is classical-quantum. The approach is similar to that of Piani et al [3] for "classical-classical" states.

Theorem *Let $\mathscr{D}=\mathscr{D}_{\mathsf{A}}$. If $I(\mathscr{D}(\rho)^{A:B})=I(\rho^{A:B})$ then ρ can be block diagonalized in some basis of $\mathscr{H}_A$.*

Proof. The equality $I(\mathscr{D}(\rho)^{A:B})=I(\rho^{A:B})$ is equivalent to $S\big(\mathscr{D}(\rho^{AB})\|\mathscr{D}(\rho^A\otimes\rho^B)\big)=S\big(\rho^{AB}\|\rho^A\otimes\rho^B\big)$. A theorem of Petz states that if a channel $\mathscr{E}$ is such that $S\big(\mathscr{E}(\rho)\|\mathscr{E}(\sigma)\big)=S\big(\rho\|\sigma\big)$ then there exists $\widehat{\mathscr{E}}$ such that $\widehat{\mathscr{E}}\mathscr{E}(\rho)=\rho$ and moreover $\widehat{\mathscr{E}}(Y)=\sigma^{1/2}\mathscr{E}^*\Big(\big(\mathscr{E}(\sigma)\big)^{-1/2}Y\big(\mathscr{E}(\sigma)\big)^{-1/2}\Big)\sigma^{1/2}$ where $\mathscr{E}^*$ is the adjoint of $\mathscr{E}$. Letting $\rho^{AB}=\sum_{aa'}|a\rangle\langle a'|\otimes\rho^B_{aa'}$, $p_a=\mathrm{tr}\big[\rho^B_{aa}\big]$, $p_a\rho^B_a=\rho^B_{aa}$ and $\sigma=\rho^A\otimes\rho^B$ gives $\mathscr{D}(\sigma)=\sum_a p_a|a\rangle\langle a|\otimes\rho^B$ and $\mathscr{D}(\rho^{AB})=\sum_a p_a|a\rangle\langle a|\otimes\rho^B_a$. It follows that $(\mathscr{D}\sigma)^{-1/2}=\sum_{a\in A}p_a^{-1/2}|a\rangle\langle a|\otimes\rho_B^{-1/2}$ and

$$\rho^{AB}=\widehat{\mathscr{D}}(\mathscr{D}(\rho^{AB}))=\sum_{a\in A}\rho_A^{1/2}|a\rangle\langle a|\rho_A^{1/2}\otimes\rho^B_a \qquad (1)$$

and $(|a\rangle\langle a|\otimes\mathbf{1}_B)\rho^{AB}(|a\rangle\langle a|\otimes\mathbf{1}_B)=\sum_{a'\in A}\big|\langle a|\rho_A^{1/2}|a'\rangle\big|^2\rho^B_{a'}=\rho^B_{aa}=p_a\rho^B_a$; if $p_a\neq0$ then

$$\rho^B_a=\sum_{a'\neq a}p_{a'}\rho^B_{a'}\qquad p_{a'}=\frac{\big|\langle a|\rho_A^{1/2}|a'\rangle\big|^2}{p_a-\big|\langle a|\rho_A^{1/2}|a\rangle\big|^2} \qquad (2)$$

so that each diagonal block is a convex combination of the others. Thus, for all the extremal states ρ^B_a of the convex hull of the ρ^B_a, $\big|\langle a'|\rho_A^{1/2}|a\rangle\big|^2=0$ if $\rho_{a'}\neq\rho_a$. If we consider the non extremal states, the extremal ones do not appear in their convex combination (2) and we may apply the same argument to their convex hull, and so on, eventually getting that $\langle a|\rho^{1/2}|a'\rangle=0$ if $\rho^B_a\neq\rho^B_{a'}$. Grouping together the a with equal ρ^B_a gives a partition $A_1,\ldots,A_k$ of A and Eq. (1) becomes

$$\rho^{AB}=\sum_{i=1}^k P_i\otimes\rho_{a_i}\qquad P_i=\rho_A^{1/2}\left(\sum_{a\in A_i}|a\rangle\langle a|\right)\rho_A^{1/2}$$

with $\langle a'|P_i|a\rangle=0$ if either $a'\in A\backslash A_i$ or $a\in A\backslash A_i$. Letting $\mathscr{H}_i^A=\mathrm{Span}\{|a\rangle:a\in A_i\}$, that implies that $\mathrm{Supp}(P_i)\subseteq\mathscr{H}_i^A$; the supports of the P_i being pairwise orthogonal, the P_i can be simultaneously diagonalized, letting ρ^{AB} block diagonal. □

We thank Kavan Modi for useful comments.

[1] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001).
[2] A. Datta, "A condition for the nullity of quantum discord," (2010), arXiv:1003.5256 [quant-ph].
[3] P. Hayden, R. Jozsa, D. Petz, and A. Winter, Commun. Math. Phys. **246**, 359 (2004), arXiv:quant-ph/0304007.

[4] D. Petz, Comm. Math. Phys. **105**, 123 (1986).
[5] M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett **100**, 090502 (2008), arXiv:0707.0848 [quant-ph].
[6] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000) pp. xxvi+676.
[7] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1655 (2012).
[8] G. M. D'Ariano, P. L. Presti, and P. Perinotti, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, 5979 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0408115.
[9] R. Alicki and M. Fannes, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **37**, L55 (2004), arXiv:quant-ph/0312081.

Optimizing over all measurement maps

In this section, if $\mathcal{E}$ is defined on the first system only then, when applied also on B, it is $\mathcal{E}\otimes\mathbb{1}_B$ that is meant.

A POVM $\mathbf{M}=\{M_m\}_{m\in M}$ is a family of operators such that $0\le M_m\le \mathbf{1}_A$ and $\sum_{m\in M}M_m=\mathbf{1}_A$. For any measurement procedure on $\mathscr{H}_A$ with outputs in M, there is a POVM such that the probability of output m given the state ρ is $\mathrm{tr}(M_m\rho)$ [6]. Following [5], we call *measurement map* associated to $\mathbf{M}$ the channel defined by $\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}}(X)=\sum_{m\in M}\mathrm{tr}\big(M_mX\big)|m\rangle\langle m|$. If ρ is a state of $\mathscr{H}_A$ then $\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}}(\rho)$ is state of $\mathscr{H}_M$ with "standard basis" $\big(|m\rangle\big)_{m\in M}$.

A POVM $\mathbf{M}'=\{M'_{m'}\}_{m'\in M'}$ with outputs in M' is a *refinement* of $\mathbf{M}=\{M_m\}_{m\in M}$, is a map $p:M'\to M$ s.t. $M_m=\sum_{m'\in p^{-1}(m)}M'_{m'}$. $\mathbf{M}$ corresponds to returning the output $p(x')$ each time $\mathbf{M}'$ output x' , i.e. $\mathbf{M}$ groups the outputs of $\mathbf{M}'$ using p, and sums their probabilities. If $\mathbf{M}'\succeq\mathbf{M}$ then there is a channel $\mathcal{E}$ s.t. $\mathcal{E}\circ\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}'}=\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}}$: Let $\mathcal{E}(X)=\sum_{m\in M}A_mXA_m^\dagger$ where $A_m=\sum_{m'\in p^{-1}(m)}|m\rangle\langle m'|$; $\sum_mA_m^\dagger A_m=\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{H}_{M'}}$ and $\mathcal{E}\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}'}(X)=\sum_{m\in M}\sum_{m'\in p^{-1}(m)}|m\rangle\mathrm{tr}\big(M'_{m'}X\big)\langle m|=\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}}(X)$

The set of POVMs with output set M is convex. Since $\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}}$ is linear in $\mathbf{M}$ and the relative information is convex in its inputs, any POVM with outputs in M and for which $I(\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}}(\rho)^{M:B})$ is optimal must be extremal [7]. Letting $M_m=\sum_{n=1}^{d_m}|e_n^m\rangle\langle e_n^m|$ be a spectral decomposition of M_m, $\mathbf{M}$ is extremal iff the $\sum_{m\in M}d_m^2$ operators $|e_n^m\rangle\langle e_{n'}^m|$ for $1\le n,n'\le d_m$ are linearly independent [8], so that there is at most d^2 operators $|e_n^m\rangle\langle e_n^m|$ where $d=\dim\mathscr{H}_A$. Let $\mathbf{M}'$ be the refinement of $\mathbf{M}$ with those POVM elements; $\mathbf{M}'$ is extremal, of rank one, with at most d^2 elements. Moreover, since $\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}}=\mathcal{E}\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}'}$ for some $\mathcal{E}$ and since $I(\mathcal{E}(\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}'}(\rho))^{M:B})\le I(\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{M}'}(\rho)^{M':B})$, it follows that the optimum mutual information is obtained considering only rank 1 POVMs indexed by a set M' of size d^2.

It is however needed to prove that there is actually a POVM for which the optimum is realized. A POVM $|e_m\rangle\langle e_m|$ of rank 1 on $\mathscr{H}_A$ defines an embedding $\imath:\mathscr{H}_A\to\mathscr{H}_M$ by $\imath=\sum_{m\in M}|m\rangle\langle e_m|$. An easy calculation shows that $\imath^\dagger\imath=\mathbf{1}_A$ if and only if $|e_m\rangle\langle e_m|$ is a POVM. Conversely, any embedding $\imath:\mathscr{H}_A\to\mathscr{H}_M$ is defined by a POVM: from $\imath|\phi\rangle=\sum_m|m\rangle\langle m|\imath|\phi\rangle$ it follows that $\langle e_m|=\langle m|\imath$.

Finally, the probability of measuring m with the POVM defined by the $|e_m\rangle\langle e_m|$ given ρ is the same as the probability of measuring $|m\rangle$ in the standard basis of $\mathscr{H}_M$ given the state $\imath\rho\imath^\dagger$. The probability of measuring m given ρ is $\mathrm{tr}\big[|e_m\rangle\langle e_m|\rho\big]=\langle e_m|\rho|e_m\rangle$. On the other hand, $\imath\rho\imath^\dagger=\sum_{mm'}|m\rangle\langle e_m|\rho|e_{m'}\rangle\langle m'|=\sum_{mm'}|m\rangle\langle m'|\langle e_m|\rho|e_{m'}\rangle$ and the probability of measuring m is also $\langle e_m|\rho|e_m\rangle$.

If follows that instead of using a POVM of rank 1, we can simply embed $\mathscr{H}_A$ in a space of dimension d_A^2 where $d_A=\dim\mathrm{supp}(\rho^A)$ and make a full projective measurement.

We now assume $\mathscr{H}_A$ has been chosen of dimension d_A^2. The optimum mutual information is then

$$\sup_{U\in\mathrm{U}(\mathscr{H}_A)}I\big(\mathscr{D}\big((U\otimes\mathbf{1}_B)\rho(U^\dagger\otimes\mathbf{1})\big)^{A:B}\big)$$

where $\mathrm{U}(\mathscr{H}_A)=\mathrm{U}(d_A^2)$ is the unitary group on $\mathscr{H}_A$. Since $\mathrm{U}(d_A^2)$ is compact, since its action is continuous, and since $S(\rho^A)-S(\rho^{AB})$ is continuous in ρ [9] (and $U\otimes\mathbf{1}_B$ leaves ρ^B fixed), there is a U for which the optimum is realized and sup may be replaced by max.

Zeroing conjugate off diagonal entries of off diagonal blocks

Since $I(\rho^{A:B})$ can never be less than $I(\mathscr{D}(\rho)^{A:B})$, one way to prove that equality implies that ρ^{AB} is block diagonal might be to show that if it were not, $I(\rho^{A:B})$ could be decreased by zeroing non zero conjugate entries not on the block diagonal. To proceed [1] made the bold statement that if conjugate non zero entries that are neither on the block diagonal, nor on any diagonal of the blocs, are replaced by 0, then the entropy of the matrix strictly increases. That implies that $I(\rho^{A:B})$ decreases since then ρ^A and ρ^B are left unchanged, only $S(\rho^{AB})$ is modified in $I(\rho^{A:B})=S(\rho^A)+S(\rho^B)-S(\rho^{AB})$.

Here is a Python 3 program that takes a two qubit density operator (thus a 4×4 matrix comprising four 2×2 blocks), returns its eigenvalues and its Von Neumann entropy and does the same on the matrix obtained after zeroing the $(00,11)$ and $(11,00)$ entries. The matrix has entropy 1.7555 and after zeroing the two conjugate entries, the entropy decreases to 1.7546 instead of increasing. The entropy also decreases if we choose the two other possible entries, $(01,10)$ and $(10,01)$. It is unclear how we could ever force the entropy to strictly increase by such methods.

```
from math import log, e
from numpy import array, linalg

def spec(m):
  return linalg.eigvalsh(m)
def S(m):
  sp = spec(m)
  return sum(-p*log(p,2) for p in sp if p !=0)
B = array([[ 0.25,   0.14,  -0.02,  -0.01],
           [ 0.14,   0.25,  -0.01,  -0.02],
           [-0.02,  -0.01,   0.25,   0.14],
           [-0.01,  -0.02,   0.14,   0.25]])
for i in range(2):
  print("The eigenvalues of\n %s" % (B))
  print("are  %s" % (spec(B)))
  print("with Von Neumann entropy %6.4f.\n" % (S(B)))
  B[0][3]=0
  B[3][0]=0
```